

FSA NEWSLETTER

JAN. , '80

Technological Change

Your FSA reps to this committee have been busy since our last discussion with you. After collecting and colating Technological Change articles from other institutes we have brought together a list of reasonable clauses for inclusion in our Collective Agreement.

At the last joint meeting both sides presented clauses and discussed the merits of each.

We have asked for a number of new, but, we feel, necessary clauses that would strengthen the procedures for the implementation of a technological change into the College.

One of those clauses would allow for settlement of all problems (such as training, retraining, etc.) before the change is implemented. In this way any affected employees can be ready for the change before the fact and not after. It is easier to start off with a settlement than to run into problems after the change is in operation. This area is a traditional "Management Rights" and therefore we expect more discussions to take place.

Grievance Report

The most notable activity on the Grievance front was perhaps the joint memo from Don Calnek and the Grievance Chair regarding submissions to JCAC. It confirmed that staff can give their revised job descriptions to anyone on the committee and have them considered by JCAC at the next meeting.

The Grievance Chair was asked by several members to look into the question of mail opening by the office area. Although prepared to act on this if necessary, the plan (to be instituted on March 1st) has been withdrawn.

Dean Harold has resigned as an Area Rep for the vocational area - west. His location in Mission made it difficult for him to receive and relay concerns. Rob Dramer (ABE) is the new representative.

Workload and 'C' contract status have been the ongoing concerns of faculty, while staff have been chiefly concerned about the JCAC issue described above.

Crunch, Crunch

Well it's crunchy time again at the negotiating table. As in past years our present contract will expire in April and will have to be renegotiated in order to strengthen clauses and include new ones to protect the employee and allow for smooth sailing throughout the year.

Good working conditions and good working situations are two very important parts of any contract to the benefit of both sides.

Your representatives on the Negotiating Committee are:

Doug McDowell - FSA Chairman
Rosie Rohatinsky - Staff Rep
Alan Davis - Faculty Rep
Eva Korelus - Staff Rep

Remember that this is a volunteer position and a great deal of hard work goes into it. If you can help these four with your ideas, please bring any to them. Doing this will not commit you to getting involved in any negotiating but you may help to improve your situation - you will certainly help the negotiating team. Don't hesitate. You will be welcomed with open arms.

Eva is now holding down two positions as she also serves on the JCAC. Rosie can't seem to stay away as she was on the Negotiating Committee last year. Doug has also served on past negotiating committees both as a faculty rep and as a resource person. To you Alan - Welcome.

To all four of you - Good Luck!

JCAC

The JCAC has been receiving an average of two new job descriptions for rating per meeting during the last couple of months. The new assignments have been keeping the members very busy. We have also lost our FSA member, Sharon Syrette, causing a heavy workload on Bertha and myself.

Negotiations

Things have been quiet since the last FSA general meeting in December.

Since then I've been collecting information from selected colleges and school districts regarding salary scales, last percentage increase, etc.

An initial meeting between myself and Bryan Hambley - the Chairman of the Board Negotiating Committee - is being arranged for the near future. I expect joint committee meetings to begin in late January.

Meetings have been set up between some senior administrators and some FSA executive members to discuss a few of the fuzzier areas such as sessionals, 'C' contracts, etc.

There should be much more to say in February.

If you did not attend the December general meeting and would like some information you should ask an executive member. Me, for example.

Alan Davis is the other faculty member and Eva Korelus and Rosie Rohatinsky are the staff reps on the Negotiating Committee.

The JCAC will adhere to the memo dated 79/12/19 written by Laura and Don, regarding job descriptions. I want to emphasize that you first go through your supervisor - if there is no response or inadequate handling of the matter, then use the JCAC. This will ensure the proper process and avoid misunderstandings on all parts.

HELP WANTED

We need a new member to replace Sharon Syrette. The Committee meets every other Thursday afternoon in Abbotsford. The applicant should be aggressive, vocal and above all WILLING. Please contact me if you are interested in serving on the JCAC.

PD Committee

There is not much new information to report, as our last two meetings have focused mainly on self-study issues (the PD Committee constitutes a unit) and on plans for the Spring PD day which is on March 19th. Kevin Busswood has kindly volunteered to organize the activities for that day, and it looks like he has some interesting sessions planned.

Since there isn't much else to report, I thought I would present the results of a little PD activity which I have undertaken, and give you some information on the buying power of your income, or, put in another way, what inflation has done to your purchasing power.

Note: If you don't care how I arrived at the figures below, then skip the next two paragraphs.

To compare the standard of living over time by examining changes in income, one has to account for the price changes which have occurred over time also. To do this, one uses index numbers. For example, the Consumer Price Index in October 1979 was 194.70 (1971=100, the base year chosen for comparison, usually a census year). This means that it will cost you \$194.70 to buy something today that would have cost you \$100 in 1971.

Index numbers are used to calculate 'real' income. In this case, we can use the Consumer Price Index to tell us what our incomes would be in 1971 dollars. Or, to put it another way, index numbers can tell us that earning \$24,000 in 1979 is equivalent to earning around \$12,000 in 1971, in terms of what you can actually buy.

Below, I have presented some samples from the faculty salary scale as it was in 1975/76 and in 1979/80. In brackets are shown the incomes adjusted to 1971 buying power. As you can see, not only is your income worth about only half as much as it was in 1971, but also, a person on, for example, step 6 on the salary scale in 1979 would be making approximately \$800 less than somebody on that scale in 1975 (the \$800 is the deficiency in terms of 1971 dollars, in terms of 1979 dollars, the deficiency is more like \$1600). The situation gets worse as you get higher up the salary scale. Also, note that the forecasters are predicting that inflation will be worse in 1980 (perhaps up to 12%, depending on events), and your buying power could continue to erode at a rate of 3/4% to 1% a month.

I have only done these calculations for selected steps on the faculty salary scale. If you want to know what your salary is in terms of 1971 buying power, then just divide your salary by 194.7 and then multiply that by 100. For example:

$$\frac{\$1000/\text{month}}{194.7} \times 100 = \$514 \text{ per month in 1971 dollars.}$$

<u>Step on salary scale:</u>	<u>1975/76</u>	<u>1979/80</u>
Step 1, P scale	13,230 (9,265)	17,379 (8926)
Step 3, R scale	16,170 (11,324)	20,856 (10,712)
Step 6, R scale	18,375 (12,868)	23,463 (12,051)
Step 12, R scale	22,785 (15,956)	28,678 (14,729)

Educational Leaves

Committee

The Educational Leaves Committee has been busily working over the past two months or so, and is well on the way to producing a final recommendation in time for the 1980 contract. We haven't worked out all the details as yet, but there is general agreement on the following points:

- There should be two classes of educational leave: short term from 5 to 90 college working days, and long term from 91 days to 1 year.
- The Joint P.D. Committee or a sub-committee should disburse leaves.
- Normal benefits (e.g. Medical, Insurance, etc.) shall be in force to an employee on leave.
- The employee on leave shall accumulate seniority at the usual rate.
- The employee will be able to return to the same, or an equivalent position after the leave is over.
- Leave taken at college request is not educational leave and will be funded by the college.
- Seniority will be one of the factors taken under consideration when the disbursing committee considers a leave application.

These were the easy items to work on. There are still many more questions to answer at our committee meetings. We have talked about, but not resolved, other issues such as:

- What is the rate of pay while on leave? We are suggesting 100% for short term and 75% for long term.
- Should the educational leave cost also include expenses? One suggestion is that any expenses be paid by the P.D. fund and educational leaves pay only salary.
- Should the Board have the right to refuse leave to an employee if it feels that it will disrupt the activities of the College? There is mixed reaction to this question. The FSA members on the Committee feel that management representation on the Joint P.D. Committee will ensure that no

disruptive leaves are approved and that a Board 'veto' is unnecessary.

- How long do you need to work to qualify for paid leave? We have suggested two years for short term leave and five years for long term. Give us your ideas on this.
- After an employee returns from leave, how long must he remain with the College? We suggested a 1-for-1 system, where the employee remains a minimum of the length of his leave. This would ensure distribution of the information from that leave through the College. The Board representatives feel that there should be a longer minimum stay after leave, as much as 1 to 3 years, but this is still under consideration.
- The Board representatives suggested partitioning funds such that a portion is allocated to faculty and a portion to staff. This would be determined by the faculty/staff ratio in the salary budget. This looks good, but it has some drawbacks. First, the higher turn-over in staff and the relative newness of many of them might mean that there would be no qualified applicants for some of the leave money. Second, the relatively small size of any staff budget might make it hard for a staff employee to get a 1 year leave due to its high cost.

Now you know what's going on in our committee. I hope that something that I've written excites or enrages you enough to make you speak your mind to us. Now, more than ever, we need input, especially from people who we don't see often such as business office staff, vocational instructors, and I'm sure there are lots more. Our next meeting is on February 13.

College Advisory Committee

Proposal that the Curriculum Committee serve as the Program Advisory Committee

This proposal, tabled at the last meeting, was unanimously defeated at this meeting since it was generally agreed that such a complex and important matter should be studied carefully. Consequently, a sub-committee for that purpose was struck; its members are: Henry Speer, Betty Urquhart, Gerald Scott (student), and a Curriculum Committee member to be appointed by the Dean of Instruction.

Policy on Student Tuition and Fees

It was reported that the Board proposes to increase student fees to \$8 per credit for all programs because it is under financial pressure and also wants a consistent fee structure for all FVC programs. This proposal will be dealt with at the next meeting. Gerald Scott distributed the following information on the implications of this proposal:

Percentage of FVC Students (full-time) receiving assistance:**

All students: 17.5%
UT/Career/Technical 35% (approx.)

(NO financial assistance is available for a program less than 6 months in duration)

Percentage of Vocational students who are fee payers (by program): **

Welding & Mechanics 50%
Agriculture 60%
Dental Assisting 60%
Building Construction 60-70%
BTSD (Level 2/3) 50%
BTSD (Level 4) 90%

Relative Effect on Proposed Tuition Fee Increases: **

<u>Program</u>	<u>Present Fees</u>	<u>Proposed Fees</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
UT (1 course, no lab)	\$ 22	\$ 24	8%
UT (1 course, lab)	\$ 22	\$ 32	31%
UT/Career/Tech (5 course, no lab)	\$110	\$120	8%
UT/Career/Tech (6 course, no lab)	\$110	\$132	29%
UT/Science (5 course, 2 labs)	\$110	\$136	19%
Business Admin. (BCIT transfer, 8 course)	\$110	\$192	43%
Vocational	\$ 15 per month	\$ 30 per month	100%

** Sources for this information: (1) Financial Aid Officer
(2) Counselling Staff
(3) FVC Catalogue - 1979/80

CAC cont.

It now appears that there is widespread concern over the apparent inequities in this proposed fee structure, which is due to the different credit assignments in various programs, so it is expected that considerable revision will be needed in this proposal.

Proposal for Communication on Policy Matters between the Board and the CAC

The President wanted an initial reaction to his Draft proposal:

The present method for policy communication between the Board and the CAC is for one group to transmit a written policy statement to the other. Little or no context is provided.

It is suggested that at least the following information be provided to the other group in addition to the policy statement itself.

- 1) A clear statement of what is being requested of the other group (e.g. approval, initial reaction, for information only).
- 2) The current status of the policy in the sending group (e.g. in the developmental stage, first reading).
- 3) A brief background statement on the intent of the policy.
- 4) The main arguments in favour of (and where appropriate, against) the policy.
- 5) Other

It is also understood that the Chair of the CAC will take the main responsibility for presenting and speaking to CAC matters going to the Board, and that the President will take the main responsibility for presenting and speaking to Board matters going to the CAC.

There was some concern about who would do #3 and how it would be controlled. There seemed to be general agreement that such statements of intent should be contained in the motion proposing the policy, but not in the statement of policy itself, so that the proposing body would have endorsed any such statements.

The President will make revisions to the proposal and bring it back to the next meeting. Basically, the proposal looks like a good move to increase communication and co-operation between CAC and the Board, thus, it is hoped, giving the College community increased influence in making policy.

Due to inclement weather, the meeting adjourned early, with the following items on the agenda for the next meeting:

- Policy on Student Tuition and Fees
- Policy on Exchange with other Institutions
- Policy on Learning Resource Center Collections
- Policy on Conferences
- Policy on Advisory Committees (This lengthy proposal is available from your CAC representatives or the CAC Minutes)
- Procedure for Communication on policy matters between the Board and the CAC
- CAC Effectiveness Review

CAC cont.

I have reported on these items previously, and the policy proposals are available in the CAC Minutes. If you have further comments to make, please forward them to me before the next CAC meeting, January 30th.